

Idaho Geospatial Committee: minutes

IGC Committee Sept 3, 2003

Call to Order: Sept. 3, 2003

Background: Jonathan Perry: Chair

Notes

Jonathan Perry, Bureau of Disaster Services, called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m.

Attendance:

Members/Designates Present: Mike Beaty, USDI Bureau of Reclamation; Nathan Bentley, ITRMC Staff; *Sheldon Bluestein, Ada County; Bart Butterfield, Department of Fish and Game; Gail Ewart, GeoNexus; Tracy Fuller, U.S. Geological Survey; Dr. Nancy Glenn, Idaho State University; *Sean Harwood, USDA Forest Service; Dennis Hill, City of Pocatello; *Karen LaMotte, Idaho State Library; Tony Morse, Department of Water Resources; Frank Mynar, Idaho Power; Jonathan Perry, Bureau of Disaster Services; Craig Rindlisbacher, City of Rexburg and Madison County; Frank Roberts, Coeur d'Alene Tribe (via telephone)

Members Absent: Senator Hal Bunderson, Idaho State Senate; Dr. Charles Bolles, Idaho State Library; Roger Hirschman, USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service; Mike McDowell, Kootenai County

Others Present: Janet Cheney, Bonneville County; Jon Eckerle, Department of Administration; Bill Farnsworth, ITRMC Staff; Emily Gales, ITRMC Staff; Virginia Gillerman, Idaho Geological Survey; Bruce Godfrey, University of Idaho; Loudon Stanford, Idaho Geological Survey; Lily Wai, University of Idaho Library

*Designate

Approval of 5/8/2003 Minutes

Background:

Notes

MOTION: Nathan Bentley moved and Dennis Hill seconded a motion to approve the May 8, 2003, IGC meeting minutes, and the motion passed unanimously.

Dot GOV

Background: Bill Farnsworth

Notes

Bill Farnsworth, ITRMC Staff, presented an overview of the newly adopted Information Technology Resource Management Council (ITRMC) IT Policy 5020, .Gov Domain, and IT Enterprise Guideline G410, Idaho.gov, Id.gov Domains. (Refer to <http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/plan&policies/policies.htm#5020> and <http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/plan&policies/guidelines.htm#G410>.)

Policy 1070

Background: Nathan Bentley

Notes

Nathan Bentley, ITRMC Staff, reviewed draft ITRMC IT Policy 1070, Geographic Information Systems, and Enterprise Guideline G420, Roles of GIS Participants (see: <http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/committees/igc/minutes/m030903/draft1070-g420.pdf>). He explained that the previous draft policy (sent by Tony Morse, Department of Water Resources [IDWR], to Committee members via e-mail shortly after the May 8, 2003, IGC meeting, and again a few days prior to today's meeting; see: <http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/committees/igc/minutes/m030903/draft1070-tmorse.pdf>) had been divided into the two aforementioned documents. This was done at the recommendation of ITRMC Staff members. Tony noted there had been no serious Committee member reservations to the draft he had last distributed, and wondered if the two new draft documents contained the same content. Nathan advised yes, it was the same content. Mike Beaty, U.S. Department of Interior (USDI) Bureau of Reclamation, pointed out there was some new content. Tony agreed; there were some subtle differences not worth worrying about.

The Department of Administration's deputy attorney general (DAG) would need to review and approve both documents after they were approved by the IGC, Nathan said. If changes were made by the DAG, Committee members would be sent revised versions prior to the next IGC meeting. Upon final IGC approval, the documents would be forwarded to the ITRMC for adoption. Tracy Fuller, U.S. Geological Survey, suggested member comments be discussed now.

Policy 1070:

"Definition," first paragraph, second sentence: Mike offered the following revision: "GIS assets are managed as a process integral to the State's business practices rather than an isolated object consisting only of hardware, software, and data."

Frank Mynar, Idaho Power, questioned whether or not the generic term "geographic information systems (GIS)" needed to be made State-specific in its definition. Mike explained his rationale for doing so.

"Definition," first paragraph, last sentence: Mike found this sentence to be a bit problematic and suggested it be stricken. There was consensus on this.

"Definition," second paragraph: Mike recommended the terms "GIS" and "computer-aided design and drafting (CADD)" be added to the list of spatial data. It was also pointed out that "photogrametry" was misspelled and should be changed to "photogrammetry."

"Definition," third paragraph: For the purpose of adding more context and elaboration, Mike suggested the following three sentences be included: "Enterprise measures are those business

decisions and/or policies that are made at the statewide level and benefit the GIS practices followed at the various State agencies and offices. Enterprise-level measures may include statewide acquisition contracts for hardware, software, data, and technical services; data content standards; interoperability requirements; records management requirements; and security protocols. State agencies are encouraged to develop and manage their respective GIS assets to best meet their needs and to integrate geospatial technology into their business processes."

Said Tony, defining the term "enterprise" as the State was a mistake. "Enterprise" could reasonably be used to mean a lot of different things, depending on context. For instance, at the IDWR, the term "enterprise" was used to describe the IDWR. Tony preferred to use the term "organization," without identifying it as either an agency or the State as a whole, and suggested any definition of enterprise be inclusive rather than exclusive. There was more discussion on use of the term "enterprise." Dr. Nancy Glenn, Idaho State University, recommended the third paragraph under "Definition" be kept as last drafted by Nathan: "An enterprise model for GIS...centers of an organization."

"Policy," C. Support the use of...: Lily Wai, University of Idaho, commented on the mention of "a State geospatial clearinghouse" versus "the State geospatial clearinghouse." (The INSIDE [Interactive Numeric Spatial Information Data Engine] Idaho website was selected as the State of Idaho's official statewide geospatial data clearinghouse in 2002.) Nathan advised he would change the wording to refer to "the" State clearinghouse. Dennis Hill, City of Pocatello, suggested INSIDE Idaho be specifically referenced as the designated clearinghouse. There was more discussion on this suggestion. It was agreed the sentence would be changed to read: "Support the use of INSIDE Idaho, the State geospatial clearinghouse for data sharing."

"Policy:" Gail Ewart, GeoNexus, pointed out that the previous draft (sent by Tony) contained simple, straightforward language. As the new "Policy" section was overworded and ungrammatical, she preferred language similar to that used in the previous draft.

Craig Rindlisbacher, City of Rexburg and Madison County, suggested this level of revision be reserved for another time. Members were encouraged to work with Nathan individually via e-mail.

Tony expressed concern with the un-timeliness of this drafting process. He thought it a problem that the previous draft policy, which he last distributed via e-mail about three business days before today's meeting, had once again been revised so soon before the meeting. There was more dialogue on this point.

Tracy recommended the policy be approved as is (with today's suggested revisions). There was more discussion on how the Committee would deal with this approval process. Two options were proposed: vote to approve the policy and guideline as submitted by Nathan, with minor changes from Committee members, or revise the documents further (after the meeting) and vote at the next meeting of the IGC.

MOTION: Dr. Nancy Glenn moved and Bart Butterfield seconded a motion to forward to the ITRMC for adoption, draft ITRMC IT Policy 1070, Geographic Information Systems, and Enterprise Guideline G420, Roles of GIS Participants, as presented by Nathan Bentley on September 3, with minor wording changes as suggested, and the motion passed unanimously.

INSIDE Idaho

Background: Lily Wai

Notes

Lily updated the Committee on INSIDE Idaho, providing a newly drafted brochure (see <http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/committees/igc/minutes/m030903/insideidaho.pdf>). She relayed Senator Hal Buderson's desire to have a single point of Internet access for all State of Idaho GIS data. Lily then reviewed background information on how INSIDE Idaho was funded and overseen.

The eight-member INSIDE Idaho Steering Committee had identified three initiatives for 2003, which pertained to a data-sharing memorandum of understanding (MOU); a business plan; and funding mechanisms.

The MOU drafted to facilitate use of the clearinghouse had been signed on behalf of all Idaho State agencies by Department of Administration Director and ITRMC Chairman Pam Ahrens. The MOU was then distributed to federal and local GIS agencies for signatures.

A draft business plan had been developed. More detailed information related to an application plan and budget proposal would soon be added.

Lily went on to describe the third of the Steering Committee's initiatives: to explore funding sources to support the clearinghouse, with the goal of obtaining stable, permanent funding. Lily then mentioned some possible alternative funding sources, and spoke on current sources.

Lily responded to questions regarding potential funding sources, and discussed some options in detail.

As of June 30, 2004, the UI Library position would be eliminated. Yet, Lily was always hopeful. Six positions had already been eliminated; and eight more positions would be eliminated within the next four years. Both Ronald Force, Dean, Library Services (Library Department) and Dr. Glenn Wilde, Vice Provost, Library/Information Technology and Chief Information Officer (Outreach and Technology Department), were in strong support of INSIDE Idaho, she said. Though she was certain the clearinghouse would be funded by the UI if funds could be found, Lily emphasized the need to be proactive in the search for alternative sources.

Mike was interested to know the usage proportion of different user groups i.e. students, government, etc. Audience member Bruce Godfrey of the UI advised he could provide these numbers.

Lily briefly discussed the recent restructuring of UI departments and councils.

Lily and Bruce were available for questions after the meeting and via e-mail. Bruce re-iterated the three initiatives identified by the INSIDE Idaho Steering Committee. These initiatives were being

addressed and accomplished, he said.

Proposed Legislation for Local Governments

Background: Craig Rindlisbacher, Sheldon Bluestein

Notes

Craig set the context of the following discussion by describing the goals identified in the Idaho Geospatial Data Implementation Plan (I-Plan). He thought the proposed legislation Sheldon Bluestien (Ada County) would talk about addressed these objectives well.

Sheldon addressed the group. He and others testified to the Legislative Interim Committee on Electronic Commerce (E-Commerce Committee), on request, during the last Legislative session concerning various GIS-related issues, including the charging by Idaho's local governments for the creation, maintenance, and dissemination of digital data. Sheldon then reviewed a portion of the 2001-2002 E-Commerce Committee's Final Report (see handout:

<http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/committees/igc/minutes/m030903/ecommerce.pdf>). He then briefed the Committee on background for drafting the proposed legislation referenced in "The Real Estate Information Technology (REIT) Plan" (see

<http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/committees/igc/minutes/m030903/reit.pdf>). This draft legislation was presented at the Annual Assessors Conference held last week in Coeur d'Alene, Idaho.

During a national conference of county assessors held last fall, Sheldon found that a lot of counties and states received no funding support for computer mapping efforts. He briefly touched on the State of Oregon's ORMAP (Oregon Map) project (a progressive program/funding mechanism originally adopted in Wisconsin), which was cited in the proposed "REIT Council Plan." Sheldon then reviewed "The REIT Council Plan" handout. With this plan, he estimated \$1.2 million could be raised annually in Idaho.

Sheldon responded to a question from Tracy regarding the proposed plan statement: "This plan would result in the elimination of the laws that allow cities and counties..." (page one under "An Outline of the Plan"). In the absence of I.C. 31-875 and I.C. 50-345, access to local government data would be covered by the Idaho Public Records Act, said Sheldon.

Frank Roberts, Coeur d'Alene Tribe, stated it would be preferable for any data-developing entity, including tribes, to have the ability to apply for the funding. Per Sheldon, tribes would be excluded, as the draft legislation was then written, and would have to work with local governments on this. Sheldon continued with review of "The REIT Council Plan."

Per Craig, by law, the assessor's offices were required to maintain map information for assessment purposes within the respective assessor's offices. It was his general feeling that, at that point, the assessor's did not understand the vision promoted by the proposed "REIT Council Plan," the benefits to them, nor their responsibility in the process. Also, it was interesting that, within about one half of Idaho's counties, GIS resided outside of the assessor's offices. This was causing tension with the assessors. In Craig's view, this was a much bigger issue than just mapping for assessment for taxation purposes. The draft "REIT Council Plan" supported the Idaho I-Plan, and so needed

to serve the needs of the counties, cities, State agencies, and federal and private entities. While assessor support was needed, said Craig, this group's limited vision could not sidetrack the effort. Further, the assessor's needed to continue to be educated in a positive way.

Sheldon spoke on the project's merit, remarking that if implemented, it would make Idaho a national leader. He then remarked on key concerns expressed by county assessors. Perhaps the county commissioners should be targeted for promotion of the project.

Janet Cheney, Bonneville County, relayed her view of some assessors' reactions to the proposed plan at their annual conference. No negative feedback was received on this new approach. One Committee member commented that the attendee group was too large, and that Sheldon was not given sufficient time to explain the concept. It was thought the plan would be a lot more well received if it were presented to smaller groups of assessors.

Sheldon was unsure of the status of moving forward with the draft legislation. He believed Senator Bunderson would sponsor it if all stakeholders were also supportive.

Mike wondered if the issue of georegistering the scanned plats had been considered, and if adding this process would be beyond feasibility/affordability. He thought inclusion of this measure would add value. Sheldon did not see a problem with this. Per Craig, there were still a number of business issues somewhat in negotiation i.e. configuration of the REIT Council and how the plan would be administered statewide.

Craig then commented that despite some frustration toward the IGC in 2002, the proposed REIT Council Plan was a major initiative the group could move forward with. Though, he was confused about how to proceed. Said Jonathan, no official ITRMC action was required, but the plan did fit in with the IGC's mission per Executive Order 2001-07. The means by which the Committee would support the plan, however, was undefined. Sheldon referred to the last two sentences of item two (GIS) of the E-Commerce Committee's Final Report for the 2001-2002 Legislative session: "In January 2003, IGC is expected to make its recommendations to ITRMC. The [ITRMC] may propose legislation in the 2003 session." Nathan suggested Sheldon (and others, as needed) meet with ITRMC Chairman Pam Ahrens for further direction. He had recently met with Ahrens on this plan, and she indicated ITRMC action was not appropriate. Said Jonathan, Senator Bunderson would most likely wish for the IGC to express its position with respect to formal support of the concept.

At the request of Committee members, Sheldon reviewed the draft legislation behind the concept (see <http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/committees/igc/minutes/m030903/reit-legislation.pdf>).

Jonathan thought it would be appropriate for the IGC to acknowledge its approval of the plan direction as outlined in the REIT Council Plan presented today.

MOTION: Dr. Nancy Glenn moved and Gail Ewart seconded a motion that the IGC support the

Real Estate Information Technology Council Plan dated August 6, 2003, and the motion passed unanimously.

Idaho Geological Survey

Background: Loudon Stanford

Notes

Jonathan introduced Loudon Stanford of the Idaho Geological Survey (IGS) Digital Mapping Lab. Per Jonathan, the Idaho State Mapping Advisory Committee, of which the IGS was a member, wanted the IGC to endorse its activities.

Loudon addressed the Committee (see <http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/committees/igc/minutes/m030903/igs.pdf>).

Craig wondered if statewide coverage was required for a framework layer. It was noted that this was not identified as one of Idaho's seven framework layers, and there was more discussion on this point.

Craig wondered what the relationship was between Idaho's established framework layers and the layers IGS had defined. Loudon responded, advising that in geology, a base map layer was needed. Hydro was used occasionally.

Loudon then responded to a question from Sheldon regarding whether the IGS model held three-dimensional properties.

Jonathan pointed out that Loudon had suggested the IGS' future mapping plans were flexible. If there were IGC members or others with an interest in this, the State Mapping Advisory Committee would welcome any input/suggestions for prioritization.

Idaho Geospatial Users' Meeting (IGUM)

Background: Nathan Bentley

Notes

Per Nathan, the 2003 Idaho Geospatial Users' Meeting (IGUM) was scheduled for October 22 and 23 at the Washington Group International, Inc. World Headquarters, Central Plaza Auditorium (Morrison Knudsen [MK] Plaza). Ann Kawalec, Ada County and leader of the Urban and Regional Information Systems Association's (URISA) Northern Rockies Chapter, had provided a lot of input into planning of the IGUM. Nathan then reviewed tentative and possible agenda items. The first day would be dedicated to State issues and reporting; the second day would focus on regional issues. It was hoped that information would be distributed by the beginning of next week (September 8). Tracy advised there was a suggestion to switch the state and regional focus days. The agenda was still in draft form.

Sheldon mentioned a meeting of southwest region GIS users was being coordinated.

New Business:

Background:

Notes

Per Jonathan, not a lot of input had been received regarding new business to be addressed by the IGC. Liza Fox, Idaho Transportation Department, had posed questions concerning metadata and I-Plan implementation. Perhaps if there were issues to be addressed, they should be assigned to Committee members, said Jonathan.

On Liza's mention of metadata, Nathan commented that the metadata standard established by the Idaho Geographic Information Advisory Committee (IGIAC) (now dissolved) was talked about at a recent meeting of the IGC Geospatial Applications Subcommittee. There, it was suggested that the IGC could adopt this standard. Nathan briefly discussed this option further. The IGIAC profile of the document was available.

Tracy recently attended a meeting held in Ketchum, Idaho, concerning the Idaho Technical Transfer (T2) Center, the Local Technical Assistance Program (LTAP) State headquarters. There was a proposal to use Local Highway Technical Assistance Council (LHTAC) funds up to \$500,000 to begin driving an effort to develop data sets (by global positioning system) for county centerlines. Legislation was also proposed to identify another \$500,000 for the project. The IGC Transportation Technical Working Group (TWG) should be made aware of this and given the opportunity to influence this undertaking in some way, Tracy said. (Nathan later volunteered to meet with the chair of the IGC Transportation TWG on September 4.) This issue was discussed further, and it was suggested that it was inconsistent with the Idaho I-Plan.

Nathan advised the federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB) had accepted the final draft version of the Idaho I-Plan and requested final hard copies. He received approval to print/publish the document; copies would be distributed once printed. There was brief discussion on the procedure and timeline for updating the plan.

There was also some discussion on statewide data development.

Next Meeting

Background:

Notes

It was preferable to hold the next meeting of the IGC prior to the December 17 ITRMC meeting. The group decided on December 4 at 10 a.m. as the next meeting date and time.

Adjourn

Background:

Notes

Jonathan adjourned the meeting at 12:55 p.m.

Friday, September 26, 2003